

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed March 2, 2007 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1-25 are rejected. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McKay (US 2003/0217111). Claims 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Poulsen (US 7,062,511). Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKay (US 2003/0217111) further in view of Poulsen (US 7,062,511). Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKav (US 2003/0217111). Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poulsen (US 7,062,511). The Applicants respectfully disagree but have amended the independent claims to more clearly define the invention.

As amended, Claim 1 recites in part “selecting an interaction to be performed on the selected element; retrieving metadata associated with the selected interaction and the selected element; when the interaction corresponds to an action to modify the metadata, performing the action with the retrieved metadata and updating the metadata in the database based on the performed action; and accessing the location from the portal in response to selection of a feature associated with the interaction when the interaction does not correspond to an action.” In

contrast, McKay does not teach an interface that allows a user to edit elements that are accessible from the interface.

For example, page 12, paragraph 123 of McKay teaches an interface that allows a user to located an element by assisting the user in narrowing a search. McKay does not teach that metadata associated with an element is modified. Instead, McKay teaches only that an element matching search criteria be returned, rather than modified. Additionally, page 8, paragraph 96 of McKay teaches that the portal may be operated in a personal manner based on a schema table. McKay, however, does not teach that the schema table may be modified by the user browsing through the portal. Thus, McKay makes no teaching that when an interaction corresponds to *an action to modify the metadata*, performing the action with the retrieved metadata and *updating the metadata in the database* based on the performed action.

Poulsen does not remedy the deficiencies of McKay. Poulsen makes no teaching of retrieving metadata associated with a selected element. In fact, Poulsen makes no teaching of selecting an element from a navigational hierarchy. Poulsen teaches only “[a] portal web site development system for generating portal web sites.” Rather than teaching a portal that allows a user to brows information presented though a portal by selecting a navigational element, Poulsen teaches only the system for development the website. As shown in Figures 4A-4I, Poulsen teaches a step-by-step interface that allows a user to enter the information needed to create a portal.

Since Poulsen makes no teaching of selecting elements from a navigational hierarchy, Poulsen cannot teach selecting an interaction to be performed on the selected element and when

the interaction corresponds to an action to modify the metadata, performing the action with the retrieved metadata and updating the metadata in the database based on the performed action. Since none of the cited references teach that when an interaction corresponds to an action to modify the metadata, performing the action with the retrieved metadata and updating the metadata in the database based on the performed action, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 2-20 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

As amended, Claim 21 recites in part a “a user interface in communication with the portal manager, the user interface displaying a navigational hierarchy of the elements accessible from the portal and displaying information associated with the elements when they are accessed from the portal, wherein the navigational hierarchy of the elements is arranged in accordance with metadata in the element database, and wherein the user interface allows a user to edit the metadata associated with the elements.” For at least the reasons presented above, Claim 21 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 21-25 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

App. No. 10/781,970
Amendment Dated: June 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

